

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Claims 1-32 were rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated May 16, 2006 in view of the following remarks.

### *In the Specification*

The Abstract has been amended to less than 150 words and to eliminate use of the word “said”.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103*

Claims 1-11, 14-25 and 27-32 were rejected were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,517,433 to Loose et al. (referred to herein as ‘Loose’) in view of Berkel and Clarke “Characterization and Optimization of 3D-LCD” (‘Berkel’).

Claims 12, 13 and 26 were rejected were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loose in view of Berkel in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,655,961 to Acres et al. (‘Acres’).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103 rejections. The rejections: a) fail to teach all the limitations in the claims, b) violate MPEP rules for the modification of a reference, and c) violate MPEP rules for the combination of references.

Loose describes a gaming machine with a digital video display presented in front of mechanical reels. He laments that “the display area of reel spinning slot machine has been fairly mundane” and cites a need for an improved display area (col. 1 lines 24-39). Loose thus adds a transparent video display in front of the mechanical reels to improve display of the reels (his intent).

The Office Action dated November 13, 2006, concedes that Loose does not describe the lenticular lens limitations recited in the claims, and relies on a combination of Loose and Berkel to reject the claims. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that “it would have been obvious to use the MVL 3D-LCD as taught by Berkel and Clarke as the video display for Loose’s slot machine”.

However, as one of skill in the art would appreciate, adding Berkel’s lenticular lens to Loose’s gaming machine would be detrimental to viewing Loose’s reels. A lenticular lens, such as that taught by Berkel would actually obscure and blur the view of Loose’s reels. The key that

makes a lenticular work is the plastic sheet that *overlays* – and often attaches to - the image being lenticularly manipulated. Loose's reels, however, are set back from the video panel (see Fig. 2A or 2B) by a considerable - and varying - distance. **When viewing the reels through the lenticular lens, this set-back reel distance would create disturbing, blurring and obscuring visual effects.** (Hence, why the lenticular image is usually set directly adjacent to backside of the lenticular lens.) At the least, the distance would obscure and blur the view of Loose's reels. While Figure 1 of Berkel (page 181) shows an LCD separate from the lenticular lens, this is done in cutaway for illustration purposes. Table 1 of Berkel (page 185) states that the focal distance of his lenticular sheet is .99 millimeters. When the image being projected by the lenticular sheet is at a focal distance greater than this, odd visual artifacts are encountered, e.g., the focal point may not be on the same plane as the reels, the reels may blur, etc.

Thus, adding the lenticular lens as proposed in the Office Action would actually obscure and blur the view of Loose's reels. This violates numerous rules for the modification of a reference in the MPEP. MPEP §2143.01 states: "The proposed modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose". In this case, Loose's intent is to improve visual perception and enjoyment of his mechanical reels. Adding the lenticular lens as asserted however would do the opposite: it would blur and obscure a person's view of the reels. It is respectfully submitted that the modification of a reference not compromise visibility and render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Combining Loose with Berkel and his lenticular lens also violates MPEP 2145.X.D.2, which states: "References Cannot be Combined Where Reference Teaches Away from Their Combination." In this case, Loose teaches a need for improving visibility and excitement of his mechanical reels; Berkel's lenticular lens oppositely would blur and obscure the reels and annoy a viewer. Thus, Loose teaches against the proposed modification and combination with Berkel.

Thus, the proposed combination would be detrimental to Loose and his gaming machine, the combination does not optically work, and the combination violates numerous rules for the modification and combination of references, For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Also, the proposed combination fails to teach limitations in the claims. Claim 1 recites: "said controller being programmed to **receive image data relating to a combination of a plurality of perspective views of an image**, said plurality of perspective views **being interlaced to form said image when displayed simultaneously**". Loose and Berkel are silent on these

limitations and the Office Action has not pointed to where the art of record teaches these limitations, such as interlacing. The other independent claims include similar lenticular processing limitations that are also not taught or suggested by the art of record. Thus, the art of record, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest the combination of limitations now present in independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 30.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 30 are allowable over Loose and Berkel.

Claims 2-13, 15-26, 28-29 and 31-32 each depend either directly from independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 30, respectively, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claim. In addition, the dependent claims recite additional elements which when taken in the context of the claimed invention further patentably distinguish the art of record.

Acres does not cure the deficiencies in Loose and Berkel.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §103 is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/William J. Plut/  
William J. Plut  
Reg. No. 59,700

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
Telephone: (408) 255-8001